

Numerical Zoom for Multiscale Problems with an Application to Nuclear Waste Disposal

Jean-Baptiste Apoung Kamga¹ Olivier Pironneau²

Abstract

We give here numerical techniques and error estimates for the numerical solution of problems with multiple scales when the small scale is confined to geometrically small regions such as jumps of coefficients on curves and surfaces or complex variations of coefficients in small regions where numerical zooms can be made. The method is illustrated on the numerical assessment of a nuclear waste repository site.

Key words: Multiscale, Finite Element, Domain Decomposition, Chimera, Numerical Zoom, Nuclear Waste.

PACS: 02.30.Jr, 47.11.Fg, 28.41.Kw, 47.55.P-

1 Introduction

The present paper deals with the numerical difficulties found in connection with multiscales when they are geometrically confined in a small region of the computational domain while an accurate answer requires a computation in the entire domain. The analysis is applied to a geophysical problem in the context of nuclear waste disposal, but similar situations are encountered often in other fields.

Steger[10] introduced his Chimera method in a similar context to compute the flow around a wing-engine configuration. The motivation was different however because finite difference methods could not handle such a complex geometry while it could be used on the wing or the engine alone. Nevertheless the basic idea of seeing the flow around the engine as a correction to the one around the wing has been a seminal one. It is even more spectacular when

Email addresses: apoung@ann.jussieu.fr (Jean-Baptiste Apoung Kamga),
Olivier.Pironneau@upmc.fr (Olivier Pironneau).

¹ Univerit Pierre et Marie Curie

² Univertit Pierre et Marie Curie

applied to cases where one geometrical domain is much larger than the other as for the computation of a the drag of a rivet on a wing. In such case every engineer computes the wing first and then zoom in the rivet and recompute the flow locally with the main flow as boundary condition. But what do we know about the numerical error involved in such decomposition?

It is easy to see that Chimera is a domain decomposition method as introduced by Schwarz in the late nineteen century. Conceptually the computational domain Ω is decomposed into two or more overlapping domains, $\Omega = \Omega_1 \cup \Omega_2$; two new boundaries appear, $\Gamma_{ij} = \partial\Omega_i \cap \Omega_j$, $i, j = 1, 2$, $i \neq j$ and the so-called Schwarz multiplicative algorithm with overlapping subdomains is

- (1) Choose ϕ_i^0 , $i = 1, 2$.
- (2) Compute ϕ_i^{m+1} by solving the problem in Ω_i with $\phi_i^{m+1} = \phi_j^m$ on Γ_{ij} .
- (3) Iterate until convergence

Convergence has been established by P.L. Lions[6] in the continuous case when the decomposition is non degenerated, i.e. when Ω_i is not strictly inside Ω_j . in the discrete case it is still an open problem when the meshes do not share common nodes and edges. In the wing-rivet problem more than one iteration is almost never done. In Steger's case however one iteration was not enough and so air outside the wing could not be the computational domain; an area smaller than the engine had to be dug out to avoid degeneracy, but as it could be aligned with the mesh the meshing problem was easy.

In [7] J.L. Lions and the author proposed a similar decomposition with the idea in mind that a domain built by Constructive Solid Geometry, as in some CAD systems, could offer a numerical advantage for PDEs. The idea was to attached to each subdomain Ω_i its own contribution ψ_i to the full solution ψ . In a variational context a PDE is set in a Hilbert space V , $H_0^1(\Omega)$ for instance, and so the method was to write :

$$\psi = \sum_i \psi_i, \quad \psi_i \in V_i \tag{1}$$

where V_i is a subspace of V attached to the subdomain Ω_i , such as $H_0^1(\Omega_i)$. So the method was conveniently called HSDM, short for Hilbert Space Decomposition Method. In the case of Laplace's equation with homogeneous Dirichlet boundary data and a source term f , it amounts to find $\{\psi_i\}_1^I$ such that $\psi_i \in H_0^1(\Omega_i)$ and

$$\int_{\Omega_i} (\nabla \sum_j \psi_j) \nabla w = \int_{\Omega_i} f w \quad \forall w \in H_0^1(\Omega_i), \quad \forall i. \tag{2}$$

There is no hope to find a unique solution because the decomposition (1) is

usually not unique, so a stabilization term is added in the iterative process:

- Choose ψ_i^0 , $i = 1..I$ and $\beta > 0$
- For each i solve

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega_i} (\beta(\psi_i^{m+1} - \psi_i^m)w + \nabla\psi_i^{m+1}\nabla w + \nabla(\sum_{j \neq i} \psi_j^m)\nabla w) \\ = \int_{\Omega_i} fw \quad \forall w \in H_0^1(\Omega_i) \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

- Iterate in m until convergence.

At the continuous level the method turns out to be nothing else than Steger's Chimera when $I = 2$, $V_i = H_0^1(\Omega_i)$ and the Ω_i make an overlapping non degenerate decomposition of Ω ; this is seen with $\phi_i^{m+1} = \psi_i^{m+1} + \psi_i^m$. However here there is a major gain in that the decomposition can be degenerate and yet convergence holds. So true zooming is possible with Ω_2 a subset of Ω_1 and ψ_2 a correction to ψ_1 .

Concurrently Glowinski, He and Rappaz introduced in [4] a similar method, with the idea that if a problem has multiple scales it might be possible to attach a correction ϕ_i to each scale. For example, knowing that $f = f_0 + \delta_z$ where f_0 is smooth and δ_z is a Dirac mass at $z \in \Omega$ on can solve (2) with f_0 attached to ψ_1 and then add the solution of the same with $f = \delta_z$ which is then attached to ψ_2 . After formalization the method comes to be almost the same as HSDM but in their second paper [5] (see also Wagner[11]) a very useful estimate is obtained for the discretization of (2) on independent meshes of size H for Ω_1 and h for Ω_2 :

$$\|\phi_H^1 + \phi_h^2 - \phi\| \leq C(H^r \|\phi\|_{H_{\Omega_1}^r} + h^s \|\phi\|_{H_{\Omega_2}^s}) \quad (4)$$

where r and s are the degree of the finite element method to compute ϕ_H^1 and ϕ_h^2

The discretization of (3) by the finite element method converges with the estimate (4) but it involves a complex integral of product of functions defined on different meshes; it can be computed exactly if the meshes are intersected, an operation which is easy in 2D and almost impossible in 3D, at least with tetraedra. Quadrature errors can deteriorate the method but a workable quadrature was obtained in [3] and [1], furthermore in the discrete case $\beta = 0$ is admissible because the solution is usually unique (see below).

The paper has two parts, one in which the method is presented with all the results mentioned above and the other were it is applied to the difficult problem of nuclear waste repository assesment.

The French government has decided to build a laboratory to test the feasibility of a repository site south of Nancy, east of Paris, for nuclear waste. The site must be assessed numerically and safety must be demonstrated for a few hundred thousand years; as there are numerous uncertainties in the geological parameters it is important to be sure of the numerical scheme and its precision.

The French agency for nuclear waste (ANDRA) posted in 2000 a numerical challenge to assess the efficiency of numerical methods and softwares for their problems, together with a test case called Couplex. In 2006 a second test case was posted with a more realistic geometry.

The challenge is an idealized vault which lies 450 meters deep inside a clay layer, which has above it a layer of limestone and a layer of marl, and below it a layer of dogger-limestone.

Water flows slowly through these porous media in a saturated state and convects the radioactive materials after some thousands of years when the canisters have rusted.

The first problem then is to compute accurately the hydrostatic pressure by Darcy's law. For stationary flow in a saturated medium this is a simple elliptic partial differential equation with non constant coefficients, but the difficulty lies in the very large variation of these coefficients from one layer to the next. The coefficient κ which appears in the Darcy operator $\nabla \cdot (\kappa \nabla \phi)$ for the hydrostatic pressure ϕ is in principle a tensor, but for simplicity here it is taken diagonal and isotropic in each layer: The enormous difference of values could

Hydrogeologic layers	Permeability K	
	[m/s]	
	Regional	Local
Tithonian	$3 \cdot 10^{-5}$	$3 \cdot 10^{-5}$
Kimmeridgian not covered	$3 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$3 \cdot 10^{-4}$
Kimmeridgian covered	10^{-11}	10^{-12}
Oxfordian L2a-L2b	$2 \cdot 10^{-7}$	10^{-9}
Oxfordian Hp1-Hp4	$6 \cdot 10^{-7}$	$8 \cdot 10^{-9}$
Oxfordian C3a-C3b	10^{-10}	10^{-12}
Callovo-Oxfordien (Cox)	$K_v = 10^{-14}, K_h = 10^{-12}$	

Table 1
Permeability coefficient in each layer.

yield a precision problem but by a simple argument of domain decomposition

we can split sequentially the problem into 4 sub problems, one in each layer, as explained in [9]. Still the aspect ratio of the clay layer which contains the repository is also enormous as it is some 10km long and only 450 meter high. It is there that a zooming strategy is required and the core of the paper is about the precision of such a strategy.

Finally, for the convection diffusion of radioactive pollutants, the source is localized in a very small region and the zoom strategy will rely on this property.

2 Layer Decomposition

2.1 Solution Over the Whole Domain

Except for the top layer which does not cover the whole ground surface, the computational domain is cylindrical with horizontal scales greater than 10km and depth only a few hundred meters, but the layers are almost horizontal and the interfaces between layers are plane as a first approximation. Darcy's law in a saturated medium gives the velocity of the water $u = -\kappa \nabla \phi$ in terms of the hydrostatic pressure ϕ and incompressibility, namely $\nabla \cdot u = 0$, gives an equation for ϕ , which when completed with appropriate boundary conditions is written as:

$$\nabla \cdot (\kappa \nabla \phi) = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega, \quad \phi|_{\partial\Omega_d} = \phi_\Gamma, \quad \kappa \nabla \phi \cdot n|_{\partial\Omega_n} = g \quad (5)$$

where the boundary of the domain has a Dirichlet part $\partial\Omega_d$ and a Neumann part $\partial\Omega_n$ and where n is the outer normal to the Neumann part.

A direct approximation of the full problem has been done with linear finite elements on a tetrahedral mesh but the usual error estimates give no information on the precision obtained because of the huge difference for κ in each layer. Figure 2.1 displays the results.

2.2 Domain Decomposition

Consider a domain Ω made of two layers Ω_i , $i = 0, 1$ with Darcy coefficient κ_i in Ω_i and $\Gamma_{01} = \bar{\Omega}_0 \cap \bar{\Omega}_1$ the interface boundary.

Denote by $\phi|_i$ the restriction to Ω_i of the solution of (5). If there is sufficient regularity two compatibility conditions hold at the interface:

$$\phi|_0 = \phi|_1, \quad \kappa_0 \frac{\partial \phi|_0}{\partial n_0} = -\kappa_1 \frac{\partial \phi|_1}{\partial n_1}, \quad \text{on } \Gamma_{01}$$




Fig. 1. Solution of the full problem with a finite element of degree 1 on triangles
Therefore if $\kappa_0 \gg \kappa_1$ and is constant in Ω_i then the problem decouples and can be solved in sequence:

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Step 1: } & -\Delta\phi_0 = 0 \text{ in } \Omega_0 \quad \frac{\partial\phi_0}{\partial n}|_{\Gamma_{01}} = 0 \\
\text{Step 2: } & -\Delta\phi_1 = 0 \text{ in } \Omega_1 \quad \phi_1|_{\Gamma_{01}} = \phi_0
\end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

plus the condition on $\partial\Omega$. The error made is as follows.

Proposition 1 *Let ϕ_c be ϕ_i in Ω_i , $i = 1, 2$ solution of (6). Let ϕ be the solution of (5); then*

$$\|\phi_c - \phi\|_{1,\Omega} \leq C \frac{\kappa_1}{\kappa_0} (\|g\|_{-\frac{1}{2},\Gamma_{01}} + \|\phi_\Gamma\|_{\frac{1}{2},\Gamma_d}) \tag{7}$$

Proof

For simplicity we assume that the support of g is in $\Gamma_n \cap \partial\Omega_0$; the results holds also in the general case but the notations are more complex and g should be replaced by κg . Let $\varepsilon = \kappa_1/\kappa_0$ and $\phi = \phi^0 + \varepsilon\phi^1 + \varepsilon^2\phi_\varepsilon^2$, the solution of problem (5):

$$\int_{\Omega} (I_{\Omega_0} + \varepsilon I_{\Omega_1}) \nabla(\phi^0 + \varepsilon\phi^1 + \varepsilon^2\phi_\varepsilon^2) \cdot \nabla w = \frac{1}{\kappa_0} \int_{\Gamma_n} g w \tag{8}$$

Let us choose $\phi^0|_{\Omega_0} = \phi_0$ and $\phi^0|_{\Omega_1} = \phi_1$ defined in (6) and ϕ^1 such that

$$\int_{\Omega_0} \nabla\phi^1 \cdot \nabla w + \int_{\Omega_1} \nabla\phi^0 \cdot \nabla w = 0$$

and such that $\Delta\phi^1 = 0$ in Ω_1 and ϕ^1 continuous on Γ_{01} . Then (10) implies

$$\int_{\Omega} \kappa \nabla \phi_{\varepsilon}^2 \cdot \nabla w + \int_{\Omega_1} \nabla \phi^1 \cdot \nabla w = 0 \quad (9)$$

All above holds for any $w \in V$, the subset of $H_0^1(\Omega)$ of functions with zero trace on Γ_d .

By this construction ϕ^1 is bounded by ϕ^0 and so ϕ_{ε}^2 is bounded at worse by $\varepsilon^{-1}\phi^1$. Therefore

$$\|\phi - \phi^0\| = \varepsilon \|\phi^1 + \varepsilon \phi_{\varepsilon}^2\| \leq C\varepsilon \|\phi^0\|$$

But ϕ^0 is ϕ_c and it is bounded by the data g and ϕ_{Γ} .

2.3 Application

Let us apply this to the Couplex problem. We define 3 independent parameters $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2, \varepsilon_3$ which are the ratios between the coefficients κ in each zones.

$$\varepsilon_1 = \frac{\kappa_{Kimmer-covered}}{\kappa_{limeTitho+Kimmers}} = 10^{-7}, \quad \varepsilon_2 = \frac{\kappa_{Callovo}}{\kappa_{Oxford}} = 10^{-4},$$

According to Proposition 1, we will have a precision 10^{-4} if we solve the problem in cascade

- **Step 1** Solve (5) first in the Tithonian+Kimmeridian with homogeneous Neumann conditions at the interface with other layers and the given conditions elsewhere.
- **Step 2** Solve (5) in the Kimmeridian covered layer with Dirichlet conditions $\phi = \phi_i$, obtained from step 1. with homogeneous Neumann conditions on unspecified boundaries.

The advantage is that now each problem has constant coefficients and the operator becomes the Laplace operator.

We have a similar decomposition below with the Oxfordian computed first.

We have applied this decomposition with P^1 tetraedric meshes in each layer. Results are shown on Figure 2.3 and compared with the global solution of the previous section. The overall precision is better than ε_2 . The gain in CPU is of course enormous.




Fig. 2. Solution within each layer (left) and difference between the global computation and the computation layer by layer (right)

3 Numerical Zoom near the repository

The repository is made of numerous galleries which are reinforced with concrete and filled with containers and swelling clay; each region has its own Darcy coefficient κ but also around some galleries there may be a fractured zone due to the drilling, and we wish to study the effect on the flow of such a zone modelled by a Darcy constant hundred times larger than in the unfractured medium. The geometry of the galleries is so complex that a mesh capable of representing it would be much too fine except may be for the largest supercomputers; in particular the mesh used above cannot represent such a geometry.

3.1 A Finite Element Zoom

So let us use (2) with $\Omega_1 = \Omega$ the whole clay layer and Ω_2 a close up, preferably convex, simply connected region containing all the galleries but not much more.

Let V_H and V_h^2 be piecewise linear continuous triangular finite element discretizations of $V = \{v \in H_0^1(\Omega) : v|_{\Gamma_d} = 0\}$ and $H_0^1(\Omega_2)$ respectively. Subscript H indicates that we use a coarse triangulation \mathcal{T}_H for Ω and h indicates a fine triangulation \mathcal{T}_h of max size h for Ω_2 .

We solve the following problem: given an interpolation ϕ_{Γ_H} of the Dirichlet boundary conditions, find $\phi_H^1 - \phi_{\Gamma_H} \in V_H^1$ and $\phi_h^2 \in V_h^2$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\Omega} (\kappa \nabla(\phi_H^1 + \phi_h^2) \nabla(w_H^1 + w_h^2)) \\
&= \int_{\Gamma_n} g(w_H^1 + w_h^2) \quad \forall w_H^1 \in V_H, w_h^2 \in V_h^2
\end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

Proposition 2 *If the edges (resp faces in 3D) of \mathcal{T}_H have no common portion with those of \mathcal{T}_h and conversely then Problem (10) has a unique solution. Furthermore it satisfies estimates (4) with $r = s = 1$ and $q = 2$ for linear elements.*

The proof was given by Brezzi in [3] and consists in observing that if two functions $u \in V_h^2$ and $v \in V_H$ coincide on a subset Λ of Ω_2 , then both u and v are *linear* (not just piecewise linear) in Λ . Indeed Δu and Δv are distributions with support on the edges of \mathcal{T}_H and \mathcal{T}_h respectively and by hypothesis these have in common only isolated points (edges in 3D); as $\Delta u = \Delta v$ the singularities can only be at these points. But $\Delta u \in H^{-1}(\Omega)$ and hence, as a distribution, its support cannot contain isolated points. Consequently u is harmonic in Λ , and being piecewise linear it is globally linear.

As said earlier the proof of (4) is in [4] but an extension to 3 meshes is given in Appendix A.

Remark 1 *In $\Omega \setminus \Omega_2$ the hydrostatic pressure ϕ is smooth while $\|\phi\|_{2,\Omega_2}$ grows with the ratio of κ in the clay and in the galleries. So h/H should be chosen accordingly.*

3.2 Implementation

The following iterative process can be used

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\Omega} (\beta(\phi_H^{1^{m+1}} - \phi_H^{1^m})w_H + \kappa \nabla(\phi_H^{1^{m+1}} + \phi_h^{2^m}) \nabla w_H^1) = \int_{\Gamma_n} g w_H^1 \quad \forall w_H^1 \in V_H \\
& \int_{\Omega} (\beta(\phi_h^{2^{m+1}} - \phi_h^{2^m})w_h + \kappa \nabla(\phi_H^{1^m} + \phi_h^{2^{m+1}}) \nabla w_h^2) = 0 \quad \forall w_h^2 \in V_h
\end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

The integrals of $\kappa \nabla \phi_H^1 \cdot \nabla w_h$ and of $\kappa \nabla \phi_h^2 \cdot \nabla w_H^1$ cannot be computed exactly except by intersecting the two meshes \mathcal{T}_H and \mathcal{T}_h . The following quadrature formula was proposed in ?? for the integral of $\nabla u \cdot \nabla v$ over $\Omega_1 \cup \Omega_2$:

$$a_h(u, v) = \sum_{k=1}^{N_H} \sum_{j=1..3} \frac{|T_k^1|}{3} \kappa \frac{\nabla u \cdot \nabla v}{I_{\Omega^1} + I_{\Omega^2}} \Big|_{\xi_{jk}^1} + \sum_{k=1}^{N_h} \sum_{j=1..3} \frac{|T_k^1|}{3} \kappa \frac{\nabla u \cdot \nabla v}{I_{\Omega^1} + I_{\Omega^2}} \Big|_{\xi_{jk}^2} \tag{12}$$

where N_H, N_h are the number of triangles and where the gradients are computed on their native triangulations and evaluated at the quadrature points ξ ; for each triangle of both triangulations 3 ξ are chosen, one near each vertex. In (12), I_Ω denotes the indicator function of Ω .

In [3] it was also shown that the bilinear form in (10) is strongly elliptic. The continuity of the elliptic form requires another hypothesis:

Proposition 3 *If in addition the no quadrature point of \mathcal{T}_h are on an edge (resp face in 3D) of \mathcal{T}_H and conversely then the bilinear form in (12) is continuous and coercive so that problem (5) with (12) is well posed and the quadrature formula does not degrade the error estimate (4).*

The proof can be found in [1].

3.3 Zoom as Corrector

One nice property of the above zoom procedure is that ϕ_H^1 is an $O(1)$ H-approximation of the solution and ϕ_h^2 is an $O(H + h)$ correction, driving the error to $O(h)$.

Proposition 4 $\|\phi_h^2\|_{1,\Omega_2} \leq C(H + h)$

The proof is a straightforward application of the triangular inequality to (4):

$$\|\phi_h^2\| \leq \|\phi_h^2 + \phi_H^1 - \phi\| + \|\phi_H^1 - \phi\| \quad (13)$$

The first term on the right is $O(H + h)$ while the second is $O(H)$.

3.4 Recursive Zoom

Now suppose that a second correction ϕ_h^3 is computed by solving over a smaller domain $\Omega_3 \subset \Omega_2$ triangulated by \mathcal{T}_h with $\tilde{h} \ll h$:

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} (\kappa \nabla(\phi_H^1 + \phi_h^2 + \phi_h^3) \nabla(w_H^1 + w_h^2 + w_h^3)) \\ &= \int_{\Gamma_n} g(w_H^1 + w_h^2 + w_h^3) \quad \forall w_H^1 \in V_H, w_h^2 \in V_h^2, w_h^3 \in V_h^3 \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

If H and h are chosen so that $\|\phi_H^1 + \phi_h^2 - \phi\|$ is $O(\varepsilon)$, and \tilde{h} is chosen so that $\|\phi_H^1 + \phi_h^2 + \phi_h^3 - \phi\|$ is $O(\varepsilon')$ with $\varepsilon' \ll \varepsilon$ then, using (4) extended to 3 meshes

(see appendix)

$$\|\phi_h^3\| \leq \|\phi_h^3 + \phi_h^2 + \phi_H^1 - \phi\| + \|\phi_h^2 + \phi_H^1 - \phi\| \leq C(\varepsilon + \varepsilon') \quad (15)$$

In the case of the vault and its galleries, the second zoom leaves out some galleries in which $\|\phi\|_{2,loc}$ is not small; for instance, h can be adhoc to describe the galleries but not the fractured zone around somme galleries. Suppose we are interested by a region in which h is fine enough to describe all the details, fractured zone, canisters etc of one gallery; suppose the numerical zoom is only in this gallery and not elsewhere, then by making use of the following estimate we can assess the error made.

Proposition 5 *Let ϕ and ψ be the solutions of*

$$\begin{aligned} -\nabla \cdot (\kappa_0 \nabla \phi) &= f \quad \text{in } \Omega, \quad \phi|_{\partial\Omega} = \phi_\Gamma \\ -\nabla \cdot (\kappa \nabla \psi) &= f \quad \text{in } \Omega, \quad \psi|_{\partial\Omega} = \phi_\Gamma \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

where $\kappa = \kappa_0$ except inside a connected region D of boundary Σ strictly inside Ω where $\kappa = \kappa_1$. Assume that κ_0, κ_1 are smooth everywhere and constant in D and $f|_D = 0$, then the following holds

$$|\phi - \psi|(x) \leq C \frac{|\kappa_1 - \kappa_0|}{d(x, \Sigma)} (\|f\|_0 + \|\phi_\Gamma\|_{1/2, \Gamma}), \quad \forall x \notin D \quad (17)$$

for some C depending on κ and Σ , where d denotes the distance of x to Σ .

The proof rely on the fact that the Green function $G(x, y)$ of the first problem

$$-\nabla \cdot (\kappa_0 \nabla G)(y) = \delta_x(y), \quad y \in \Omega, \quad G|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$$

decays like $|x - y|^{-1}$. Indeed, let $\xi = \phi - \psi$

$$\begin{aligned} \xi(x) &= \int_{\Omega \setminus \Sigma} \delta_x(y) \xi(y) = - \int_{\Omega \setminus \Sigma} \nabla \cdot (\kappa_0 \nabla G(x, y)) \xi(y) \\ &= - \int_{\Omega \setminus \Sigma} \nabla \cdot (\kappa_0 \nabla \xi(y)) G(x, y) + \int_{\Sigma} \kappa_0 \left(\frac{\partial G}{\partial n} [\phi] - \left[\frac{\partial \xi}{\partial n} \right] G \right) \\ &= \int_{\Sigma} \kappa_0 \left[\frac{\partial \psi}{\partial n} \right] G(x, y) dy \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

Now $|\left[\frac{\partial \psi}{\partial n} \right]| = \left| \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial n} \right|_{\kappa_1}$, $\|\partial_n \psi\|_{-1/2, \Sigma}$ is bounded by $C(\|f\|_0 + \|\phi_\Gamma\|_{1/2})$ and $\|G(x, \cdot)\|_{\infty, \Sigma}$ is bounded by a $C/d(x, \Sigma)$ for some C (see [8]).

Remark 2 *when several regions Σ_i have $\kappa \neq \kappa_0$ the estimate contains $\sum d(x, \Sigma_i)^{-1}$;*




Fig. 3. Hydrostatic pressure near the galleries: Second and third zoom from data computed by layer decomposition. The second iteration with results of the first on the finest zoom (right) did not alter in any visible way the results on the left. The picture on the right displays the level lines on an horizontal cross section through the symmetry plane of the gallery and a color map of the hydrostatic pressure on the surface of the part of the gallery above the cross section.

so in the exemple of figure 2.3 the zoom is outside all the blind galleries containing the other canisters but their distance to the zoom region makes their influence small. The main gallery is more problematic because the part just outside the zoom is not correctly meshed if it is not homogeneous. Thus at the level of the first zoom the mesh should be refined near to the second zoom.

Figure 4 shows the results of a local computation around all galleries (first zoom) in the clay layer, followed by a zoom around one of the blind gallery containing the canisters (second zoom). The second geometry accounts for the fractured zone, the cement of the gallery and the swelling clay around the canisters in the center of the gallery.

After the second zoom the first one is recomputed but almost no change is observed.

4 Convection-Diffusion of Radionucleides

After a few thousands of years some canister leak. The radionucleides are dissolved in the ambient water and the concentration of each element, like iodine I^{129} , $c(x, t)$, is given by

$$\alpha \frac{\partial c}{\partial t} + \beta c + u \cdot \nabla c - \nabla \cdot (\nu \nabla c) = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega \times (0, T)$$

$$c(\cdot, 0) = c^0 \quad \text{in } \Omega, \quad c \text{ or } \frac{\partial c}{\partial n} = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega \quad (19)$$

where α accounts for the sorption in the medium, β accounts for the radioactivity decay, $u = -\kappa\nabla\phi$ is the convection by the Darcy flow and ν is the diffusion tensor of the medium.

The source term is an initial condition because the time over which a canister leaks is short in geological terms. So c^0 is confine geometrically to a very small region of space within the gallery where the second zoom is made.

If G is the Green function of problem (19) then

$$c(x, t) = \int_{\Omega} G(x - y, t) c^0(y) dy \quad (20)$$

By a change of variable (19) rewritten in a Lagrangian frame is similar but with $u = 0$ and a classical estimate (see Aronson[2] for example) tells us that there exists C such that

$$|G(x - y, t)| \leq \frac{C}{t^{3/2}} e^{-\frac{|x-y|^2}{Ct}} \quad (21)$$

Therefore, coming back to the physical domain

$$c(x, t) < |D| |c^0|_{\infty} \frac{C}{t^{3/2}} e^{-\frac{|x-x_D|^2}{Ct} - \beta t} \quad (22)$$

where D is the support of c^0 augmented by a region of diameter $|u|_{\max}t/\alpha$ and x_D is the point in D closest to x .

This gives us the tool to limit the computational domain, at least for a short geological time.

Proposition 6 *Let c be the solution of (19) and \tilde{c} the solution of the same but in $\tilde{\Omega}$ containing D . Then*

$$\|\tilde{c} - c\| \leq C_1 |c^0|_{\infty} \frac{C}{t^{3/2}} e^{-\frac{|x-x_D|^2}{Ct} - \beta t} \quad (23)$$

This inequality holds because both c and \tilde{c} are solutions of the same equation on $\tilde{\Omega}$ but with different Dirichlet boundary conditions; so (23) is a consequence of the continuity of the solution with respect to boundary data.

Remark 3 *In practice it is better to compute \tilde{c} with Neumann conditions on*




Fig. 4. Concentration of iodine due to the break-up of a canister in a gallery.

$\tilde{\Omega}$ because one can then check the size of c on $\partial\Omega$ and stop the computation when it is too large. After that time \tilde{t} a bigger computational domain can be chosen and the simulation is reinitialized with $c^0 = \tilde{c}(\cdot, \tilde{t})$. Then the mesh can be coarse because \tilde{c} is spread over a large domain.

On Figure ?? a simulation of the early stage of break up of the canister is done, first near the canister itself then in a bigger domain

5 Conclusion

We have analyzed in depth a numerical zoom strategy in the elliptic case. It shows that the method is feasible and adapted to cases where the complexity of the solution is only in a small part of the geometry. With the Hilbert Space Decomposition Method iterations should be performed between the zoom region and the full domain, however the size of the irregularities both in number and in geometrical size greatly reduce the number of iterations and indeed in several case it is possible to use one iteration only as done in practice in engineering but not justified by an error analysis.

A Extension of (4) to 3 meshes.

This proof is a straightforward adaptation of the one given in [11]

Let u be solution of a strongly elliptic bilinear variational problem

$$a(u, v) = (f, v), \quad \forall v \in H_0^1(\Omega); \quad u \in H_0^1(\Omega) \quad (\text{A.1})$$

Let $u_{Hh\tilde{h}}$ denote a function which is the sum of a function of $V_H \subset H_0^1(\Omega)$ plus a function of $V_h \subset H_0^1(D)$ plus a function of $V_{\tilde{h}} \subset H_0^1(O)$ where these

are finite element spaces of degree one over triangulations of Ω , $D \subset \Omega$ and $O \subset D$ respectively. Let $u_{Hh\hbar} \in V_H + V_h + V_{\hbar}$ be a solution of:

$$a(u_{Hh\hbar}, v_{Hh\hbar}) = (f, v_{Hh\hbar}) \quad \forall v_{Hh\hbar} \in V_H + V_h + V_{\hbar} \quad (\text{A.2})$$

For some $u^1 \in H_0^1(\Omega)$, $u^2 \in H_0^1(D)$, $u^3 \in H_0^1(O)$, we choose $w_H = \pi_H u^1$, $w_h = \pi_h u^2$, $w_{\hbar} = \pi_{\hbar} u^3$, where the π are the interpolants on the meshes. Let $w_{Hh\hbar} = w_H + w_h + w_{\hbar}$ and $v_{Hh\hbar} = u_{Hh\hbar} - w_{Hh\hbar}$. The following holds

$$a(u, v_{Hh\hbar}) = a(u_{Hh\hbar}, v_{Hh\hbar}) \quad \text{and so} \quad a(v_{Hh\hbar}, v_{Hh\hbar}) = a(u - w_{Hh\hbar}, v_{Hh\hbar})$$

Therefore $\|v_{Hh\hbar}\| \leq \|u - w_{Hh\hbar}\|$ and so

$$\|u - u_{Hh\hbar}\| \leq \|u - w_{Hh\hbar}\| + \|v_{Hh\hbar}\| \leq 2\|u - w_{Hh\hbar}\|$$

Finally, if $u^1 + u^2 + u^3 = u$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|u - w_{Hh\hbar}\| &\leq \|u^1 - w_H\| + \|u^2 - w_h\| + \|u^3 - w_{\hbar}\| \\ &\leq C(H\|u^1\|_2 + h\|u^2\|_2 + \hbar\|u^3\|_2) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.3})$$

Now it remains to choose the u^i intelligently.

By taking u^1 to be an extension in D of $u|_{\Omega \setminus D}$ we secure $\|u^1\|_2 \leq \|u\|_{2, \Omega \setminus D}$ and we notice that $v^1 := u - u^1 \in H_0^1(D)$ and $\|v^1\|_2 = \|u - u^1\|_{2, D}$.

Next, by taking u^2 to be an extension in O of $v^1|_{\Omega \setminus O}$ we secure $u^2 - v^1 \in H_0^1(O)$ and $\|u^2\|_2 = \|v^1\|_{2, D \setminus O}$.

Now $u^3 := u - u^1 - u^2 = v^1 - u^2 \in H_0^1(O)$ and so $\|u^3\|_2 = \|u^3\|_{2, O}$.

This proves that

$$\|u - u_{Hh\hbar}\| \leq C(H\|u\|_{2, \Omega \setminus D} + h\|u\|_{2, D \setminus O} + \hbar\|u\|_{2, O}) \quad (\text{A.4})$$

References

- [1] J.B. Apoung-Kamga and O. Pironneau : A Numerical Quadrature for the Schwarz-Chimera Method. Proc. Domain decomposition Conf. Jan 2005, New-York, D. Keyes ed.
- [2] D.G. Aronson: Bounds for the fundamental solution of a parabolic equation. Bull of the AMS, 73 (1967), 890-896.

- [3] F. Brezzi, J.L. Lions and O. Pironneau: Analysis of a Chimera Method. C.R.A.S., **332**, 655-660, (2001).
- [4] R. Glowinski, J. He, J. Rappaz, and J. Wagner: Approximation of multi-scale elliptic problems using patches of finite elements. C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris, Ser. I, 337:679 684, 2003.
- [5] R. Glowinski, J. He, A. Lozinski, J. Rappaz, and J. Wagner: Finite element approximation of multi-scale elliptic problems using patches of elements. Numer. Math., 101(4):663687, 2005.
- [6] P.L. Lions: On the Schwarz alternating method, I,II,III. Int. Symposium on Domain decomposition Methods for Partial Differential Equations. SIAM Philadelphia (1988, 89, 90).
- [7] J.L. Lions and O. Pironneau: Algorithmes parallèles pour la solution de problèmes aux limites. C.R.A.S., **327**, 947-352 (1998).
- [8] W. Littman, G. Stampaccia and H. Weinberger: Regular point for elliptic equations with discontinuous coefficients, Ann. Sc. Norm. Sup. Pisa 17 (1963),45-79.
- [9] O. Pironneau: Domain Decomposition for the Couplex Exercise.
- [10] J.L. Steger: The Chimera method of flow simulation. Workshop on applied CFD, Univ. of Tennessee Space Institute (1991).
- [11] J. Wagner: Finite element methods with patches and applications Thesis 3478, EPFL, Lausanne 2006.